

**REMARKS**

Claims 4, 6 and 13 remain in this application. Claim 13 is allowed, and claims 4 and 6 are rejected.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,953,677 to Sato ("Sato patent") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0033556 to Krishnamurthy, et al. ("Krishnamurthy, et al. publication"). The above Office Action states that the Sato patent does not teach a communication device that uses a service discovery protocol to look for a fixed position sensor for sensor information to adjust the power consumption level of a communication device in response to the sensor information. The Office Action further suggests that the Krishnamurthy, et al. publication describes these elements missing from the Sato patent.

Claim 4 provides, *inter alia*, a communication device that uses a service discovery protocol of a wireless ad hoc network to look for a fixed position sensor for the sensor information to reduce the power consumption level of the communication device in response to the sensor information. It is important to note that the communication device uses a service discovery protocol and looks for a fixed position sensor.

The Krishnamurthy, et al. publication describes a method for extending a zone routing protocol to provide a framework for routing data in a wireless ad-hoc network with unidirectional links. The Krishnamurthy, et al. publication is concerned with the mobility of the nodes, which make the topology of the network time-variant (see paragraph [0002], lines 5 through 7). The Krishnamurthy, et al. publication does not describe or suggest any type of fixed

position sensor, let alone a communication device that uses a service discovery protocol of a wireless ad hoc network to look for a fixed position sensor for the sensor information to reduce the power consumption level of the communication device in response to the sensor information, as required by claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 distinguishes patentably from the Sato patent, the Krishnamurthy, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these references.

In addition, the Krishnamurthy, et al. publication describes a wireless ad-hoc network but does not describe or suggest any type of service discovery protocol for the network. Paragraph [0002] describes wireless ad-hoc networks as mobile nodes that communication with each other, characterized by low bandwidth links that are subject to harsh conditions of fading and interference. The Krishnamurthy, et al. publication references path and route discovery at paragraphs [0059] and [0094], but does not describe or suggest any type of service discovery protocol. Thus, the Krishnamurthy, et al. publication does not describe or suggest a communication device that uses a service discovery protocol of a wireless ad hoc network to look for a fixed position sensor for the sensor information to reduce the power consumption level of the communication device in response to the sensor information, as required by claim 4. Therefore, claim 4 further distinguishes patentably from the Sato patent, the Krishnamurthy, et al. patent, and the suggested combination of these references.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0021278 to Hinckley, et al. ("Hinckley, et al. publication"). Applicants hereby submit a Declaration to establish conception in the United States of the claimed subject

matter in the referenced patent application and diligence to the filing of the referenced patent application prior to the effective date of the Hinckley, et al. publication.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 4 and 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claim 6 are respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hill, Thomas C., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:  
Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department (HDW)  
600 North US Highway 45  
Libertyville, IL 60048

|                              |                 |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| <u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u> | <u>08/11/06</u> |
| Hisashi D. Watanabe          | Date            |
| Attorney for Applicant(s)    |                 |
| Registration No. 37,465      |                 |
| Telephone: (847) 523-2322    |                 |
| Facsimile: (847) 523-2350    |                 |